

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 94 09:01:46 PDT  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #667  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Wed, 15 Jun 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    667

Today's Topics:

                                      "73's"  
                                      (none)  
                                      Atlanta Hamfest?  
                                      Com'l License Exams & Adv. Cl. Lic.  
                                      FCC Database  
                                      IMMEDIATE LICENSING? Bad implementation. Good idea.  
                                      JPOLE.EXE calculates measurements of antenna for desired freq v1.1  
                                      K8EFS ????  
                                      Operating in Greece  
                                      Tone encoder on Icom IC-2SA  
                                      Who makes Super Station Master Antennas?  
                                      Yaesu phone no.???  
                                      You know its time to retire from the hobby when.... (4 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 14:55:20 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!  
uhog.mit.edu!news.kei.com!wang!dbushong@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: "73's"  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

teacherjh@aol.com (Teacherjh) writes:

>Language is dynamic, not static. 73's (the plural of 73, by many  
>official accounts) means "Best Wishes". It didn't used to, but it

>does now.

>Therefore, 73 means "best wish". So, if you say 73, you are only  
>wishing the listener one wish. OK, it's your best one, but it's  
>still only one. If you want to be more ebulliant, use 73's. (Or you  
>can try 146, 219, or any of the other multiples of 73 to give a fixed  
>number of wishes.)

Didn't you see Aladdin? You can't wish for more wishes.

Sheesh.

3333333,

Dave

--

Dave Bushong, Wang Laboratories, Inc.

-----  
Date: 15 Jun 94 14:37:10 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: (none)  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

subscribe

Morao Esteban  
z801183a@bcfreenet.seflin.lib.fl.us

-----  
Date: 15 Jun 1994 11:17:38 -0400  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!  
news.duke.edu!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!st6000.sct.edu!not-for-  
mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Atlanta Hamfest?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Atlanta Hamfest: at the Cobb Galleria Centre, in Marietta near the  
Cumberland Mall (funny, i thought that was Smyrna...) July 23, 24.

Info number is (404) 717-5893

I got this info from the latest SERA journal.

Hope to see you there! 73 de n1kdo

-----  
Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 13:10:40 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!  
gatekeeper.es.dupont.com!eplrx7!eplrx7.es.dupont.com!duncanfj@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Com'l License Exams & Adv. Cl. Lic.  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

w1gsl@ATHENA.MIT.EDU (Steven L. Finberg) writes:

>In article <1994Jun14.014949.20260@nuchat.sccsi.com> acs@news.sccsi.com  
>(A.C. Spraggins) writes:  
>>  
>>Does anyone know of a site where I can download the FCC question pool for  
>>the commercial license exams? I understand that about 80 percent of the  
>>quiz comes from the pool of the Advanced class study material. The pool  
>>changes next month and I would like to take the test over the old questions.  
>>

>I know of no "on line" source for the commercial exam Q pool. As one of  
>W5YI's commercial examiners I can also tell you the pool does not change  
>next month. The only question pool that changes in July 1994 is the amateur  
>general class exam.

Don't know where you can download anything, by there is an excellent  
Commercial program by QSO Software that has not only the Questions and  
answers but also explanations graphics and progress analysis on line!  
Comes for either the Mac or IBM compatible. I know - I wrote it! Call  
1-800-GUD-DX73 for more info. Jeff WB3B  
>

>\*\*\*\*\*  
>Steve Finberg W1GSL w1gsl@mit.edu  
>PO Box 82 MIT Br Cambridge MA 02139-7082 617 258 3754  
>\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
Date: 15 Jun 1994 13:52:35 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!  
moe.ksu.ksu.edu!wizard.uark.edu!comp!plaws@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: FCC Database  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

bob@mtdcr.att.com (14033-R.SCHREIBMAIER(MT5655)1223MT) writes:

>Actually, Buffalo has more current information (January 1994).

>USL goes back to November 1993.

The "newest" group D callsign I could find in the 5th call district (at Buffalo) was KC5DVY issued October 12, 1993.

Peter Laws <plaws@comp.uark.edu> | "Let's make sure history never forgets the  
n5uwy@ka5bml.#nwar.ar.usa.noam | name ... Enterprise" ST:TNG - 1987-1994

-----  
Date: 15 Jun 1994 13:33:50 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!  
news.umbc.edu!haven.umd.edu!cville-srv.wam.umd.edu!ham@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: IMMEDIATE LICENSING? Bad implementation. Good idea.  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Immediate licensing was an EXCELLENT idea. I believe that nearly EVERY ham on the air would have agreed with this. The VE's giving the exam should have been allowed to call the FCC computer, use a modem, and enter the data directly into the FCC database, at which point a call-sign would have been spit out. Ideally, THIS is the way it should be.

The system that was proposed? People just passing their exams would be assigned a call that consisted of "WZ" plus the call district plus their first, middle, and last initials, plus a license class identifier. Find the problems here...

No records on file at the FCC. How do you track someone causing interference or operating illegally? YOU DON'T.

What's to keep a non-ham from "inventing" his own call for a while? Why would ANYONE get suspicious with WZ3SRR/T on the air? Not only would there be no problem for someone doing this, but there would also be no REASON to suspect the person. Why would the person stop xmitting, either? After a time, just change the callsign, and again, nobody would ever suspect a thing. No records, no control.

How about two people with the initials JTS, one for John T. Smith of Florida and one for James T. Sutter of Virginia. Say they both passed their exams for Technician class, and were awarded WZ4JTS/T. TWO people with the same callsign. Go and figure THAT one out.

A good idea, terrible implementation.

--

73,

----- The  
      \ / Long Original  
Scott Rosenfeld Amateur Radio NF3I Burtonsville, MD | Live \$5.00  
WAC-CW/SSB WAS DXCC - 125 QSLed on dipoles -----| Dipoles! Antenna!

-----  
Date: 15 Jun 1994 08:58:29 -0400  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!  
magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!csn!col.hp.com!srngenprp!news.dtc.hp.com!  
hpscit.sc.hp.com!hpuerci.atl.hp.com!hpuerca!edh@@.  
Subject: JP0LE.EXE calculates measurements of antenna for desired freq v1.1  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In <1994Jun14.124232.13801@brtph560.bnr.ca> jwittich@b4pph107.bnr.ca (Jeffrey Wittich) writes:

>>The following uses a calculator to give you the 1/4 wave section  
(stuff deleted)

>>((((300 x .91) -:- 146) -:- 4) -:- 2.45) x 100)

>>

>>Ed Humphries N5RCK

>Hey Ed, shouldn't that 2.45 actually be 2.54 for making the  
>conversion from CM to INCHES?

>Just wondering.

>73, Jeff.

Wonder no more Jeff :-) Just beware teh power of a tpyo and  
always proorfead you post before posting it!

My apologies to all for letting the typo slip through on my  
original post. Of \_course\_ the correct conversion factor is  
2.54! And I was taught to check my numbers more carefully !

Thanks for pointing out my error Jeff.

Cheers & 73  
Ed Humphries N5RCK  
HP Atlanta GA

-----  
Date: 15 Jun 94 14:05:36 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!sunic!trane.uninett.no!

eunet.no!nuug!EU.net!sun4nl!ruuinf!ruunfs.fys.ruu.nl!faculty.chem.ruu.nl!  
besten@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: K8EFS ????  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Is there anyone out here who can give me some info on K8EFS.  
Is he still alive? Is his computer with logs still 'broke'.

You get the meaning. I'm trying to get cards from him but  
still nothing. I tried to phone him but he has a secret number (and I  
can guess why (!)).

Is he still valid as QSL manager?

Perhaps anyone can tell me how to obtain a card from 9K2ZR (period june '92)  
and V51E (july '90).

It concerns 50 MHz QSO's which must be confirmed for me to apply for my DXCC  
on 50 MHz.....

Thanks,

Remco, PA3FYM

-----  
Date: 15 Jun 1994 12:24:16 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!csn!  
col.hp.com!srngenprp!news.dtc.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hpuerce.atl.hp.com!  
hpuerca.atl.hp.com!kpm@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Operating in Greece  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I will be going to Greece in September and I need to know if I can get  
a temporary license to operate 2m radio for 1 month. Which agencies do I  
contact in USA or Greece? 73's

KE4IHB

-----  
Date: 15 Jun 94 14:24:36 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Tone encoder on Icom IC-2SA  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I recently bought an Icom IC-2SA and UT-51 tone encoder in Hong Kong.

Does anyone out there in net-land know the following:

- Please respond to [wayne@csg.mot.com](mailto:wayne@csg.mot.com)

-----

Who makes Super Station Master antennas?  
Anyone have a current phone number for them?  
tnx  
Jeff

---

Kenneth.Guthrie@launchpad.unc.edu (Kenneth Guthrie) writes:

>Thanks,

Number is 310 404-2700 Jeff WB3B

> - - - - -





emerald.nist.gov!proctor@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: You know its time to retire from the hobby when....  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

You go shopping, get to the check-out, write a check, and sign it KE3H0.

--  
James E. Proctor | proctor@onyx.nist.gov | National Inst. of Stand. & Tech.  
My opinions are my own. I have the receipt to prove it.  
\*\* They're not going to pave the Information Supergravelroad, \*\*  
\*\* they're only going to pave the on-ramps! \*\*

-----  
Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 14:56:49 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!uhog.mit.edu!  
news.kei.com!wang!dbushong@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: You know its time to retire from the hobby when....  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>>... you're talking on the phone with a ham buddy, and you end the  
>>conversation and hang up the phone with a 'KD1HZ clear'.

>...you end a face-to-face conversation with "dit dit".

...you're having a Saturday breakfast and you say "call please" so  
that you can interrupt a conversation to ask someone to pass the salt.

--  
Dave Bushong, Wang Laboratories, Inc.

-----  
Date: 15 Jun 1994 14:16:45 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!  
moe.ksu.ksu.edu!wizard.uark.edu!comp!plaws@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2svtr6\$ba@newsserv.cs.sunysb.edu>, <rogjdCr6MJJ.MEA@netcom.com>,  
<gregCrFsIp.4Mx@netcom.com>laws  
Subject : Re: \*\* WAITING PERIOD FOR LICENSE ?? \*\*

greg@netcom.com (Greg Bullough) writes:

>In article <rogjdCr6MJJ.MEA@netcom.com> rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington)

writes:

>>

>>As you probably noted elsewhere on this thread, the ARRL has done quite a  
>>bit to bring about faster licensing.

>So the wait period (someone noted 16 weeks) is acceptable, then? Sorry,  
>but absurd is absurd is absurd. And 16 weeks is absurd. Especially when  
>we note that the actual work the FCC does takes about 30 seconds. Tops.

Here: get a filled out 610 and sit at your terminal. Now, type all that  
info in. Did it take you 30 seconds? If yes, then I suggest you apply  
for the job at Gettysburg.

>No, the FCC proposed a solution, instant licensing, which would allow  
>them to do their thing without impacting people waiting to get on the  
>air, and that great representative of Amateurs everywhere, the ARRL,  
>shot it down. I suspect that even the old 'we took a survey and found

No, no, no. The League shot down a proposal that would have allowed  
anyone to purchase a 2m HT from the J.C. Whitney catalog and get on the  
air immediately without any bothersome studying or exams.

In a still-somewhat-rural area like NW Arkansas the FCC's proposal would  
work since everyone knows who the VEs are and vice versa. Pirates (with  
legitimate-sounding calls) would be caught almost immediately. Can you  
imagine how many NYC cabs would have 2m HTs if the FCC's plan were  
implemented? Enforcement, what little there is, is tough enough.

The real problem with the proposal, IMHO, is that it parallels what  
happened in the Citizen's Radio Service in the '70s and '80s. First the  
fee went from ~\$20 to ~\$4 to \$0 as the backlog got bigger. Then the FCC  
allowed self-assigned calls (K + initials + ZIP code, I think) for use  
during the interminable wait, then finally just let the whole thing go.  
And another fine radio service bites the dust ...

Do we really want to allow the FCC to drop the Amateur Radio Service  
"ball" like they dropped the CB "ball"? I think not. Congrats to the  
ARRL for not allowing that to happen and for having an alternate proposal  
ready (electronic VE filing).

73,

Peter Laws, N5UWY - V31WY

Peter Laws <plaws@comp.uark.edu> | "Let's make sure history never forgets the  
n5uwy@ka5bml.#nwar.ar.usa.noam | name ... Enterprise" ST:TNG - 1987-1994

-----

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 13:11:54 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!  
rogjd@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2ti5fs\$j07@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, <rogjdCrE1ED.1IE@netcom.com>,  
<2tketk\$3os@nyx10.cs.du.edu>  
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Jay Maynard (jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu) wrote:

: That's just the hams of Texas as a whole, with the Texas VHF-FM Society. That  
: doesn't include quite a bit of service locally with various repeater clubs.  
: Even so, I'll buy that you've been around the service, and serving ham radio  
: as a whole, for quite a while. Your uninformed arguments led me to believe  
: otherwise.

Another snotty comment Jay. Your trademark, I see.

: >I've found that people who blow a lot of stack gas about how much they do  
: >for the hobby, how long they've been in it (as though that somehow means  
: >they are better ops than some of the FB newcomers to our hobby) usually  
: >are mostly hot air. Your puffed up rhetoric is a prime example of this  
: >sort of braggadacio. The rest of us are not impressed.

: I can't control that...but the fact remains that I speak about the  
: practicalities of coordination from personal experience. Do you?

Yep. You just don't accept my arguments, which is your business. But it  
would give your arguments more credibility if you stuck to proposing them  
and refrained from personal attacks on your opponents.

: >Mostly on this thread you've alternated between name calling, attacking  
: >other people's dedication to the hobby, and then whining about all the  
: >money you've put into the hobby, all the service, etc. Stop whining!  
: >It's a hobby!

: I can throw that one right back at those who whine about not being able to  
: put up an open repeater on 440. Quit whining! Pick another band!

Well, Jay, once again, there you go. If your unspoken premise that  
everyone who doesn't agree with you ought to get the heck off of 440  
weren't so arrogant, it would be comic.

There's nothing comic about the name calling in which you engage, however.

: >Well, that's your privilege. It's mine, along with a lot of other  
: >people, to disagree with you.

: I don't argue that. Everyone has the right to be wrong. :-)  
: When you start advocating that coordinators do patently stupid things that  
: will get them sued into oblivion, though, I have to stand up and yell, "HELL  
: NO!"

Cites Jay. Cite the cases. I don't think you know jack about the law or  
suing, etc. Another silly argument that you have advanced repeatedly in  
this thread is essentially that anyone who changes coordination on an  
existing repeater is going to be sued and run into the ground financially.  
That's drive1. That's just not how the legal system works, and once  
again, if your tone weren't so arrogant your argument would be comic.

: >We probably wouldn't disagree if the situation here weren't so out of  
: >hand. I personally would entertain having a number of closed repeaters if  
: >the reason could be justify and the number was limited so as not to crowd  
: >out the possibility of large number of open repeaters. Operating a  
: >repeater, like operating any other station, is a \*\*\*privilege\*\*\* not a  
: >right. Do closed repeaters have a place? Perhaps. But not to the  
: >exclusion of all others as is presently the case here in Southern  
: >California. That was the topic of this thread, Jay. All of your whining  
: >about how this point of view would take away your repeater and  
: >how it fails to take into account your wonderful 10 years of service to  
: >the hobby, etc. etc. is simply off the topic.

: No, it's right on topic. Operaring a repeater is a privilege that can only be  
: revoked by the FCC. As a coordinator, I can't tell you not to put up a  
: repeater.

See, now this remark is just intended to cloud the issue. Your muddy  
thinking is funny. First you tell me that I shouldn't complain that no  
one \*\*Can\*\* put up open repeaters on 440, then you say that no one can  
stop anyone from doing it.

: There's simply no way to outlaw, or restrict, closed repeaters in a way that  
: won't get coordinators sued. There's certainly no way to \_remove\_ existing  
: closed repeaters.

Another irrelevancy! Who ever said that closed repeaters ought to be  
\*\*\*removed\*\*\*????? No one on this thread! What has been brought forth  
as a suggestion is that coordinators have a responsibility to see that  
their coordination policies serve not just a select group of existing  
repeater owners, but rather the amateur community as a whole. An entire  
band of private and closed repeaters, arguably, flunks this test.

The thread, btw, is about Southern California. Your comments illustrate a gross level of ignorance of how things are out here.

: My experience with the coordination process gives me the real-world experience to back up my statements. As such, it's relevant.

: >Jay, believe it or not, some of us like to conduct a discussion without  
: >name-calling and putting the other fellow down. Your approach of  
: >attacking your opponent rather than his argument belies your oft-repeated  
: >claim of how much service to the hobby you've put in. In radio clubs and  
: >in real life few people want to work with or be around people who behave  
: >in this fashion.

: Fine. Let me know when you want to conduct a discussion in that fashion.  
: You're certainly not doing it now. In the meantime, I'll simply point out that  
: there are others in this group - and in this discussion - that can back up my  
: word.

: >Since we've established that I've been in amateur radio a heck of a lot  
: >longer than you, the first part of the above paragraph is exposed as being  
: >wrong (as well as snotty). As for your condescending, unpleasant diatribe  
: >about the complexity, well, thank you for the insight. But please,  
: >concision.

: I'll concede the issue of how long you've been in ham radio. That makes it all  
: the more surprising that you still believe it's a black-and-white issue; the  
: longer I'm involved with it, the more complex it gets. I'm being as concise as  
: I can while still arguing the whole issue.

Sorry Jay, but you're way off base. You are the one who has consistently advanced red herring arguments and attributed various, non-existent arguments to others on this thread. Like the suing argument, which you have not backed up with any facts.

Since you've been in amateur radio so very long, Jay, let's have a list of those cases which you claim exist if repeater owners suing coordinating bodies. I'm betting its hot air. Cites please.

--

rogjd@netcom.com  
Glendale, CA  
AB6WR

-----  
End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #667

\*\*\*\*\*